

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

ALONZO BRADLEY

Plaintiff,

v.

RAYTHEON COMPANY,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Cause No. 03:08-CV-0869-O

ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

After reviewing all relevant matters of record in this case, including the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge and any objections thereto, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the undersigned District Judge is of the opinion that the Findings and Conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct and they are accepted as the Findings and Conclusions of the Court.

The Magistrate Judge made a detailed examination of the evidence and argument of the parties and sorted out findings, conclusions and a recommendation in his opinion that addressed each of the various theories presented by Plaintiff in the form of causes of action pled and argued in supporting briefs. *See* Doc. # 67 ("Mag. J. FCR").

Although Plaintiff did not lodge objections, the Court notes that Plaintiff is *pro se*, and in the interest of justice has particularly given careful attention to Plaintiff's arguments and the evidence presented in support of his opposition to summary judgment. While the material produced by Plaintiff in response to the Motion indicates the sincerity

of his suspicions,¹ it does not present evidence supporting any of his stated or apparent² causes of action. The pleadings and admissible evidence before the Court show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that Defendant Raytheon Company is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

Having independently reviewed all of the pleadings and the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that summary judgment is **GRANTED** to Defendant Raytheon Company and that this case is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** together with all claims stated therein.

So **ORDERED** this 6th day of January, 2010.


Reed O'Connor
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Asked with reference to one alleged discriminatory employment decision, "Does the fact that an African American person was given that job change your opinion that you [as an African American] didn't get that job because of race discrimination?" *Id.* at 155. Plaintiff replies, "Of course not." *Id.* That portion of the deposition in which it occurred was submitted by Plaintiff as evidence of discrimination.

² The Court has read Plaintiff's pleadings and materials liberally, as did Magistrate Judge Sanderson. See, e.g., Mag. J. F.C.R. at 10 (giving effect to an apparent claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1981 for matters pled under the inapplicable 42 U.S.C. § 1982).